



Shell Oil Company
Roberta S. Lewis
Senior Legal Counsel
Legal Services - U.S.
One Shell Plaza
910 Louisiana - OSP 4864
Houston, TX 77002
Phone: (713) 241-7188
Fax: (713) 241-4081
Email: Roberta.Lewis@Shell.com

December 2, 2010

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Craig Whitenack, Civil Investigator
United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region IX, Southern California Field Office
600 Wilshire Avenue, Suite 1420
Los Angeles, California 90017

Re : Yosemite Creek Superfund Site, San Francisco, CA
Pennzoil Quaker State Company
Supplemental Response to 104 (e) Information Request

Dear Mr. Whitenack:

I represent Pennzoil Quaker State Company in the above-referenced matter. The attached Supplemental Response provides additional information in response to the October 15, 2009 request for information ("RFI") of the United States Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA") to Pennzoil-Quaker State Company ("PQS") with regard to the Yosemite Creek Superfund site (the "Site"). PQS received a letter dated August 24, 2010 requesting that PQS supplement its original response, dated January 14, 2010 ("Original Response"). Subject to both the general and specific objections noted in PQS's Original Response, and those noted in the responses below, and without waiving these or other available objections or privileges, PQS submits the following in response to the RFI and in accordance with telephone conversations between counsel for PQS and counsel for EPA, Michael Massey, limiting the scope of certain responses as noted below.

In responding to the RFI, and preparing this Supplemental Response, PQS has undertaken a diligent and good faith search for, and review of, documents and information in its possession, custody or control and that are relevant to this matter, or as requested, although not relevant to this matter. As discussed in more detail in PQS's Original Response, the RFI purports to seek a great deal of information that is not relevant to the Site or alleged contamination at the Site. By agreeing to provide additional information that is not directly

Craig Whitenack, Civil Investigator
December 2, 2010
Page 2

relevant to the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site or any connection to the Bay Area Drum State Superfund Site at 1212 Thomas Avenue in San Francisco, California (the "BAD Site"), PQS does not intend to waive any of the objections to the RFI on the basis raised in its original response. PQS also does not admit that any of the additional information provided herein has any relevance to the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site.

The RFI defined "COCs" as any of the contaminants of concern at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane ("DDT"), chlordane, dieldrin, and poly chlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs"). However, certain RFI requests also seek information regarding hazardous substances more broadly. These requests go beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and are not relevant to the Site pursuant to Section 104 (e) (2) (A) of CERCLA; thus PQS has limited its additional review of documents and information relating to other facilities to the COCs identified by EPA as being relevant to the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site.

As you know, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and PQS's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to PQS and the DTSC files include both PQS's Responses to DTSC's information request, among other documents. We understand that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to the EPA. However, PQS is providing copies of such documents that were provided to PQS in the course of its involvement with the BAD site.

If you have any questions regarding the response below, please contact me.

Sincerely,



Roberta S. Lewis

cc: Ron Averill
Carol Campagna

Attachments

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

PQS incorporates herein by reference the general privileges, protections and objections with respect to the RFI and each information request therein from its Original Response into this Supplemental Response.

Subject to the foregoing objections and all objections stated within PQS's responses to individual requests, the following are PQS's supplemental responses to the RFI.

PQS incorporates by reference each individual response in its Original Response into each individual response in this Supplemental Response.

INFORMATION REQUEST REQUESTS AND RESPONSES

- 1. Describe generally the nature of the business conducted by Respondent and identify the products manufactured, formulated, or prepared by Respondent throughout its history of operations.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying each of the products manufactured by PQS is not feasible due to the scope of products and long history of the company.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

The facility at 2015 Grand Street, Alameda, CA, which opened in 1951, blended, packaged, sold and delivered petroleum products to its customers throughout the San Francisco-Oakland, California area. These petroleum products are typically motor oil, lubricants, industrial grease products and other consumer automotive products. Products were primarily packaged in small containers until approximately 1965, when some products began to be packaged in drums.

The Pennzoil Products Company Vernon Packaging Plant at 3430 E. 26th Street, Los Angeles, California manufactured motor oil and related products through the blending of various oil feedstocks and additives. Products from this facility were packaged in various forms, warehoused on site and shipped to PQS branch locations or to customer locations as needed. The distribution process apparently entailed filling drums with lubricants at the Vernon facility, loading them on trailers, then taking them to

Pennzoil branch locations or customers. The lubricants were pumped from the drums to containers at the Pennzoil branch office or customer location. After PQS was purchased by Shell in 2002, this location became the Shell Lubricants/PQS Distribution Center. It ceased manufacturing at that time and became primarily a warehouse to store and distribute products.

Branch locations in California and the immediately surrounding states (AZ, NV, OR), as well as Hawaii, believed to be branch locations which operated as distribution/warehouses only, included:

- Pennzoil Products, P. O. Box 2967, Tucson, AZ
- Pennzoil F & S Dist on Mason (F & S was actually a carrier used by PQS as opposed to a branch)
- Pennzoil Products, 3201 Bandini Blvd., Vernon, CA
- Pennzoil, 11651 Hart St., North Hollywood, CA
- Colton Branch, 1443 Miller Dr., Colton, CA 92324
- Pennzoil, 5470 Wynn Rd., Suite #400, Las Vegas, NV 89118
- Pennzoil, 1190 Orchard St., Coachella, CA 92236
- Pennzoil, 1225 Burton St., Fullerton, CA 92631
- Pennzoil Products, Ventura, CA
- Pennzoil Products, Lancaster, CA
- Pennzoil – Hawaii
- Pennzoil, 5155 Mercury Point, San Diego, CA
- Pennzoil Products, 5413 Avalon, Los Angeles, CA
- Pennzoil Products Co., Bakersfield, CA
- Pennzoil Products, Santa Maria (OCSP 0427/Block 156), Santa Maria

Quaker State locations included a location at 19501 S. Santa Fe Ave., Rancho Dominguez, (a.k.a. Carson), CA. This was a blending, packaging, distribution location which opened in 1985, after the previous blending location, believed to be at 1401 Newdock St., Terminal Island, Long Beach, California closed in the mid 1980s. Products blended, packaged, distributed and marketed included primarily motor oil and automotive lubricants. The following types of finished products appeared to be stored/available in drums at this site: various grades of motor oil, racing oil, aviation oil, snowmobile oil, outboard oil, diesel lube, motorcycle oil, tractor hydraulic/transmission fluid, automotive transmission fluid, hydraulic oil, hoist oil, Stoddard solvent, kerosene, protective coating products, anti-freeze, gear lubricants, chain and bar lubricants, grease, chassis lubes, Stoddard/clelzolene misc. specialty part cleaner, brake fluid, diesel fuel drier, diesel fuel treatment and power steering fluid.

Interviews with knowledgeable employees indicated that both the Quaker State Terminal Island and Rancho Dominguez locations received product via tank truck and tank car. It

was unloaded into tanks, then dispensed as required via tank truck or piped in to the main building for packaging in 1 quart, 5 quart or 55 gallon drums.

Other locations, believed to be branch locations which operated as distribution/warehouses only, identified included:

- 85 San Julian St., Ventura, CA
- 3363 Santa Fe St., Fullerton, CA
- 6352 Ethel Ave., San Bernadino, CA
- 7343 Carroll Rd., San Diego, CA
- Branch 79, San Luis Obispo, CA
- 1335 Dayton St., Salinas, CA
- 4500 Broadway, Salida, CA
- 1982 Stone Ave., San Jose, CA
- 1701 Poplar St., Oakland, CA
- Chico, CA
- Reno, NV
- Sacramento, CA
- Las Vegas, NV
- Carson, CA
- 681 Huff St., San Bernadino, CA
- 1831 Demino Way, Sparks, NV
- Eugene, OR

2. Provide the name (or other identifier) and address of any facilities where Respondent carried out operations between 1940 and 1988 (the "Relevant Time Period") and that:

- a. Ever shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale.
- b. Are/were located in California (excluding locations where ONLY clerical/office work was performed);
- c. Are/were located outside of California and shipped any drums or other containers to California for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale (for drums and containers that were shipped to California for sale, include in your response only transactions where the drums and containers themselves were an object of the sale, not transactions where the sole object of the sale was useful product contained in a drum or other container).

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, in addition to facilities with a connection to the BAD Site, Request No. 2 purports to also seek information regarding any facility located in California (excluding locations where ONLY clerical/office work was performed) and any facility located outside of California that shipped drums or other containers to any location in California, even to locations other than the BAD Site. These other facilities have no nexus with the BAD Site, and thus this request seeks information that is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 1 for information regarding facilities where PQS carried out operations between 1940 and 1988 in California and/or surrounding states.

- a. In addition to the information provided in PQS's Original Response, PQS provides the following information:

As EPA is aware, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control ("DTSC") conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and PQS's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to Pennzoil and Quaker State and the DTSC files include both Pennzoil's and Quaker State's Responses to DTSC's information request, among other documents. We understand that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to the EPA. However, PQS is providing copies of such documents that were provided to PQS in the course of its involvement with the BAD site. These documents are included on two CDs hereby submitted with this response and numbered PQS2 00001-01967.

No additional information, other than what was provided in PQS's Original Response, regarding drums or other containers shipped within California to the BAD Site for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale were located.

- b. PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 1 indicates facilities operated by PQS between 1940 and 1988 that were in California (excluding offices where only clerical work was performed).
- c. See Supplemental Response to Question No. 17, below relating to drum reconditioning practices of PQS in California during part of the requested timeframe.

Drums from the locations in Tucson, AZ and Las Vegas, NV listed in response to Question No. 1 may have been returned from those locations to Cooper Drum/Waymire for reconditioning.

Also, PQS was alleged by EPA to have sent drums to the Lorentz Barrel and Drum Site in San Jose, CA between 1958-1964, but no documentation was produced in that matter by EPA or DTSC indicating which PQS facility is alleged to have sent drums to that site. No documentation or information was located in the possession of PQS during due diligence for responding to a CERCLA 104(e) request for that site indicating that any drums were sent from any PQS facility, in or out of California, to that site.

No documentation was located through a diligent search indicating that any facility outside of California (the search was limited to the immediately adjacent states of Oregon, Nevada and Arizona) shipped any drums or other containers to the BAD Site for recycling, cleaning, reuse, disposal, or sale.

- 3. Provide a brief description of the nature of Respondent's operations at each Facility identified in your response to Question 2 (the "Facilities") including:**
- a. The date such operations commenced and concluded; and**
 - b. The types of work performed at each location over time, including but not limited to the industrial, chemical, or institutional processes undertaken at each location.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. In particular, but without limiting the generality of the foregoing objection, PQS objects to the request in (b.) that it describe "types of work performed at each location over time..." Without identification by the EPA of the types of work it is referring to, it would be virtually impossible, given the broad nature of possible work at various facilities, to describe each and every type of work that was performed at any facility. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Responses to Questions No. 1 and 2.

4. **For each Facility, describe the types of records regarding the storage, production, purchasing, and use of Substances of Interest ("SOI") during the Relevant Time Period that still exist and the periods of time covered by each type of record.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks to require PQS to describe "types of records". Where documents have been provided in response to this RFI, each and every document regarding SOIs is not also "identified" by describing its contents. PQS further objects to Request No. 4 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus PQS has limited its review of documents and information to COCs identified by EPA.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

Quaker State merged with Pennzoil to form Pennzoil-Quaker State in 1998. The Pennzoil-Quaker State Company became a wholly owned subsidiary of Shell Oil Company in 2002. Records transferred to Shell's possession were usually accessible by a specific location name or specific address. Since these questions inquire into circumstances and matters which occurred during a time period considerably outside of Shell's/PQS's normal document retention policy, it is likely that there would be little or no documentation in the possession of Shell which would provide assistance in developing a response. Quaker State indicated in its response to the DTSC's request for information regarding the BAD Site that records prior to 1986 were destroyed in accordance with that company's record retention policy. Nevertheless, PQS conducted an extensive review of an index of over 17,500 available records, and more than 100 possibly relevant boxes were retrieved and reviewed for responsive documents. Documents relating to the storage, production, purchasing, and use of hydraulic oil and some documents identifying lead, mercury and zinc that were located with respect to the facilities identified in response to Question 1 are attached hereto and numbered PQS2 01968-02116. No documents located through this search indicate that these SOIs were in drums sent to the BAD Site or were sent to the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site.

5. **Did Respondent ever (not just during the Relevant Time Period) produce, purchase, and use, or store one of the COCs (including any substances or wastes containing the COCs) at any of the Facilities? State the factual basis for your response.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. By removing any temporal limit and any nexus between COCs at PQS's Facilities and the BAD Site, Request No.5 purports to seek information relating to PQS's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

PQS and QS lubricants plants typically manufactured motor oil and related product through the blending of various oil feed stocks and additives. Documents from outside the Relevant Time Period indicate that some small amounts of zinc may have been present in additives used at the Vernon, CA facility after the Relevant Time Period. We did not locate documents from the Relevant Time Period indicating that any of the COCs were produced, purchased, used or stored at the facilities. Products from these facilities were packaged in various forms, warehoused on site or at branch warehouse distribution locations and shipped to PQS/QS branch locations or to customer locations as needed.

It is important to note that not all of the products manufactured or handled at these facilities would have been handled, stored, packaged or distributed in 55 gallon drums that may or may not have gone to the site. Additives may have been delivered to the facilities in tanker trucks and stored in tanks prior to blending into products. Wastes were disposed off-site in accordance with regulations, and some liquid waste streams, particularly from drum cooperage operations at Alameda, CA and Vernon, CA were sent to the sewer as allowed by the local authorities.

- 6. If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify each COC produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.**

RESPONSE:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 5.

- 7. If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the time period during which each COC was produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.**

RESPONSE:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 5.

- 8. If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the average annual quantity of each COC produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.**

RESPONSE:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 5.

- 9. If the answer to Question 5 is yes, identify the volume of each COC disposed by the Facility annually and describe the method and location of disposal.**

RESPONSE:

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 5.

- 10. Did Respondent ever (not just during the Relevant Time Period) Produce, purchase, use, or store hydraulic oil or transformer oil at any of the Facilities? State the factual basis for your response to this question.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. By removing any temporal limit and any nexus between hydraulic fuel or transformer oil at PQS's Facilities and the BAD Site, Request No. 10 purports to seek information relating to PQS's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

Based on a review of records and available information from extensive employee interviews, PQS and/or QS may have produced, purchased, used, or stored hydraulic oil or transformer oil at a facility, however, PQS has found no written documentation to indicate that any of these specific materials were previously contained in any empty drums that may have gone to the BAD Site.

PQS located documentation indicating that PCBs were not present in certain products it purchased. These documents are attached hereto, numbered PQS2 01968-01988.

- 11. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify each specific type of hydraulic oil and transformer oil produced, purchased, used, or stored at each Facility.**

RESPONSE:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Request No. 10. Quaker State merged with Pennzoil to form Pennzoil-Quaker State in 1998. The Pennzoil-Quaker State Company became a wholly owned subsidiary of Shell Oil Company in 2002. Records transferred to Shell's possession were usually accessible by a specific location name or specific address. Since these questions inquire into circumstances and matters which occurred during a time period considerably outside of Shell's/PQS's normal document retention policy, it is likely that there would be little or no documentation in the possession of Shell which would provide assistance in developing a response. Quaker State indicated in its response to the DTSC's request for information regarding the BAD Site that records prior to 1986 were destroyed in accordance with that company's record retention policy. Nevertheless, PQS conducted an extensive review of an index of over 17,500 available records, and more than 100 possibly relevant boxes were retrieved and reviewed for responsive documents. Several documents produced herewith mention hydraulic oil. See documents numbered PQS2 01989-02001. No information requested by Questions 12, 13, or 14, was located through this search with respect to the hydraulic oil mentioned. No documents indicated that any of these materials were sent to the BAD Site or the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site.

- 12. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the time period during which each type of hydraulic oil and transformer oil was purchased, produced, used, or stored.**

RESPONSE:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Request No. 10.

- 13. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the average annual quantity of each type hydraulic oil and transformer oil purchased, produced, used, or stored at each Facility.**

RESPONSE:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Request No. 10.

- 14. If the answer to Question 10 is yes, identify the volume of each hydraulic oil and transformer oil disposed by the Facility annually and describe the method and location of disposal.**

RESPONSE:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Request No. 10.

- 15. Provide the following information for SOI (SOIs include any substance or waste containing the SOI) identified in your responses to Questions 5 and 10:**

- a. Describe briefly the purpose for which each SOI was used at the Facility. If there was more than one use, describe each use and the method and location of disposal.**
- b. Identify the supplier(s) of the SOIs and the time period during which they supplied the SOIs, and provide copies of all contracts, service orders, shipping manifests, invoices, receipts, canceled checks and other documents pertaining to the procurement of the SOI;**
- c. State whether the SOIs were delivered to the Facility in bulk or in closed containers, and describe any changes in the method of delivery over time;**
- d. Describe how, where, when, and by whom the containers used to store the SOIs (or in which the SOIs were purchased) were cleaned, removed from the Facility, and/or disposed of, and describe any changes in cleaning, removal, or disposal practices over time.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 15 purports to seek information relating to PQS's facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Responses to Requests No. 5 and No. 10.

16. For each SOI delivered to the Facilities in closed containers, describe the containers, including but not limited to:

- a. The type of container (e.g. 55 gal. drum, tote, etc.);**
- b. Whether the containers were new or used; and**
- c. If the containers were used, a description of the prior use of the container.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 16 purports to seek information relating to PQS's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, PQS provides the following supplemental information:

No documentation relating to delivery of SOIs to the facilities identified in response to Question 1 was located. See PQS's Supplemental Response to Request No. 17.

17. For each container the respondent used to store a SOI or in which SOIs were purchased ("Substance-Holding Containers" or "SHCs") that was later removed from the Facility, provide a complete description of where the SHCs were sent and the circumstances under which the SHCs were removed from the Facility. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. PQS further objects to Request No. 17 as it assumes that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that

particular customer. According, Request No. 17 purports to seek information that does not exist.

PQS further objects to Request No. 17 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus PQS has limited its review of documents and information to COCs identified by EPA.

Additionally, as stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 17 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites other than the BAD Site. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS is providing EPA with certain information and documents that contain information related to PQS's Facilities that shipped drums or other containers to the BAD Site.

See PQS's Supplemental Responses to Requests No. 2, 5, 10 and 16.

In addition, as to handling of containers generally, PQS's August 23, 2005, December 17, 2008 and May 20, 2009 responses to EPA's CERCLA 104(e) Request for Information regarding the Cooper Drum Site in Los Angeles County, California indicated the following regarding handling of containers that may have been sent to drum recyclers:

The main PQS facility which had a business relationship with Cooper/Waymire Drum was the facility located at 3430 E. 26th Street, Los Angeles, California. Previously, this location was known as Pennzoil Products Company's Vernon Packaging Plant. This plant manufactured motor oil and related products through the blending of various oil feedstocks and additives. Products from this facility were packaged in various forms, warehoused on site and shipped to PQS branch locations or to customer locations as needed. After PQS was purchased by Shell in 2002, this location became a PQS Distribution Center. At that time, it ceased to be a blending facility and became primarily a warehouse where product is stored.

Interviews with knowledgeable employees indicated that this plant had a business relationship with Cooper/Waymire Drum Company from approximately 1978 until the early 1990s. The distribution process during the relevant timeframe apparently entailed filling drums with lubricants at the Vernon facility, loading them on trailers, then taking

them to Pennzoil branch locations or customers. The lubricants were pumped from the drums to containers at the Pennzoil branch office or customer location.

The empty drums were usually either: 1) taken back to the Vernon location by the PQS truck or contracted common carrier for later pick up by drum reconditioners such as Cooper/Waymire; 2) left at the branch or customer location for later pick up by drum reconditioners such as Cooper/Waymire, or 3) taken directly to drum reconditioners such as Cooper/Waymire by the PQS truck or contracted carrier. Documents (including Empty Drum Certifications and Empty Drum Receiving Records) that appeared to reflect drums returned from PQS locations to Cooper/Waymire for reconditioning were provided to the EPA with PQS's responses. In any case, the business relationship between PQS and Cooper/Waymire was centralized through the Vernon facility at 3430 E. 26th Street, Los Angeles, California.

Documents that appeared to reflect drums returned from Quaker State ("QS") locations to Cooper Drum were provided to the EPA with PQS's Second Supplementary Response to the Information Request regarding Cooper Drum.

Based on interviews with a knowledgeable former Quaker State employee, the Quaker State Terminal Island, Rancho Dominguez and warehouse distribution locations' relationship with Cooper Drum consisted of strictly a Buy/Sell agreement. Quaker State sold empty drums and bought reconditioned and new drums from Cooper as well as other drum companies. Within the QS documents provided in its response to the EPA's Information Request regarding Cooper, there were Cooper Drum Receiving Slips showing drums from the Rancho Dominguez and other distribution warehouse locations. In addition, there were "Stock Transfer" documents appearing to transfer inventory volumes of drums from the Cooper Richmond, California location to the Cooper South Gate location (Cooper Drum Site) for Quaker State. Cooper would sometimes pick up drums at the distribution warehouse locations which were located closer to Cooper's Richmond location, so they would be delivered there. Then the "Stock Transfer" documents would move them, basically on paper, to Quaker State's inventory from the South Gate location for Quaker State to buy from Cooper there. There were also copies of checks written from Cooper Drum to Quaker State. This was part of a Buy/Sell agreement where Quaker State would sell drums to Cooper and they would write Quaker State a check. Quaker State would normally buy reconditioned drums, and later, new drums outright from Cooper.

The other locations were distribution warehouse locations whose relationship with Cooper Drum was similar in that Cooper would deliver drums to the locations and pick up drums to take back to Cooper. Sometimes, Quaker State distribution warehouse locations might bring their own empty drums back to the Quaker State Rancho Dominguez location to be picked up by Cooper there.

The beginning and ending timeframe for Quaker State's use of Cooper Drum is not clear, however, the QS documents provided to the EPA range in date from 1986 to 1988. Quaker State wrote in its January 21, 1992 response to the Bay Area Drum Information Request that "For the year 1987 which records still remain the total number sent to Myer Drum for the year was 4,864. The vast majority of the empty drums were sent to Cooper Drum Co. of 2200 Central St., Richmond, Ca. and Ted Levine Drum Co., 303 S. Serrine, Meza, Arizona 85210."

The Alameda, CA facility also had a drum cooperage operation on-site from 1951 until approximately 1978. Empty drums were sent from other PQS facilities to the Alameda facility to be reconditioned in this cooperage operation. PQS has not located records of how many drums were sent from each facility to Alameda.

PQS has found no documents or information indicating that any SOIs or COCs identified by EPA for the Yosemite Creek Site were sent in containers to the BAD Site.

Pursuant to conversations with Counsel for EPA, we are not required to provide supplemental information relating to the time period since 1988.

- 18. For each SHC that was removed from the Facility, describe Respondent's contracts, agreements, or other arrangements under which SHCs were removed from the Facility, and identity all parties to each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 18 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites other than the BAD Site. To the extent the EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS is providing the following supplemental information:

See PQS's Supplemental Responses to Questions No. 2 and 17. PQS has found no documents or information indicating that any SOIs or COCs identified by EPA for the

Yosemite Creek Site were sent in containers to the BAD Site. Pursuant to conversations with Counsel for EPA, we are not required to provide supplemental information relating to the time period since 1988.

19. **For each SHC, provide a complete explanation regarding the ownership of the SHC prior to delivery, while onsite, and after it was removed from the Facility. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. PQS further objects to Request No. 19 as it assume that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that particular customer. Accordingly, Request No. 19 purports to seek information that does not exist. As stated in the RFL, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 18 purports to seek information regarding SHCs that were sent to sites others than the BAD Site.

See PQS's Supplemental Responses to Questions No. 2 and 17.

Other than the information provided in PQS's response to the DTSC, PQS has no information regarding containers sent to the BAD Site. With regard to general container handling, some employee interviews and documents relating to the Cooper Drum Company site in Los Angeles County, California, indicated that the PQS Vernon location had a drum cleaning operation onsite until approximately 1984. If drums were sent from the PQS Vernon location to Cooper prior to 1984, employee interviews indicated they would probably have been open-topped, dented, smashed or possibly additive drums.

Based on PQS's First Supplemental Responses to the EPA's Request for Information regarding Cooper, drums sent for recycling were empty. This was further substantiated by drum delivery documents included in this response which typically consisted of an "Empty Drum Certification" from Pennzoil Company and a corresponding "Empty Drum Receiving Record" from Cooper/Waymire Drum Co., Inc.

The Empty Drum Certification contains the following statement: "We hereby certify that these drums are 'empty' as that term is defined in the federal Environmental Protection Agency regulations, 40 CFR 261.7*, and that they have been properly prepared for transportation under the regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation 49 CFR 173.29.**" The regulations are footnoted on the page and the document has signature lines for the Drum Originator, Transporter and Destination. The corresponding "Empty Drum Receiving Record" contains the following "empty Drum Certification": "I hereby certify that these drums are 'EMPTY' as that term is defined in the California hazardous waste regulation, CCR Title 22 Section 66261.7, and that they have been properly prepared for transportation under the regulations of the U.S. Department of Transportation, 49 CFR 173.29 (see reverse side)." The reverse side contains the text of the California regulation.

Many of the drum delivery documents provided to the EPA in PQS's First Supplemental Responses for the Cooper Drum Site identified the material previously contained in the drums as "motor oil", "oil", "petroleum products", "petroleum", "motor oil/grease" or "motor oil/gear oil". PQS has no written documentation of any prior contents of drums sent for reconditioning to the BAD Site.

Based on Quaker State employee interviews, drums sent to the Cooper site from the facilities would have been turned upside down to drain and therefore were empty prior to shipment. This is substantiated by the Cooper Drum Receiving Slips which typically contained an "Empty Drum Certification" on the back of the document. The Empty Drum Certification contains the following statement: "I hereby certify that these drums are "empty" as that term is defined in the national Environmental Protection Agency regulations, 40 CFR 261.7* and that they have been properly prepared for transportation under the regulations of the Department of Transportation, 49 CFR 173.29.**" The regulations are footnoted and the document has a signature and date line at the bottom of the page. PQS has no written documentation of any prior contents of drums sent to the BAD Site. It was PQS's practice to only deliver empty drums for reconditioning.

PQS has not located any similar information regarding any other of its facilities.

20. **Identify all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for procurement of Materials at the Facilities. Also provide each individual's job title, duties, dates performing those duties, current position or the date of the individual's resignation, and the nature of the information possessed by each individual concerning Respondent's procurement of Materials.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Request No. 20 purports to seek information relating to PQS's Facilities that is not relevant to contamination at the Site. PQS further objects to Request No. 20 as it purports to seek information regarding procurement of "Materials" at facilities other than the BAD site and thus goes beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows: Pursuant to telephone discussions with Counsel for EPA, due to the breadth of this request, we are not required to supplement this answer at this time.

21. Describe how each type of waste containing any SOIs was collected and stored at the Facilities prior to disposal/recycling/sale/transport, including:

- a. The type of container in which each type of waste was placed/stored;**
- b. How frequently each type of waste was removed from the Facility;**

Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 21 purports to seek information regarding collection and storage of "any SOIs" at facilities other than the BAD Site. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows: Pursuant to telephone discussions with Counsel for EPA, due to the breadth of this request, we are not required to supplement this answer at this time.

22. Describe the containers used to remove each type of waste containing any SOIs from the Facilities, including but not limited to:

- a. The type of container (e.g. 55 gal. drum, dumpster, etc.);**
- b. The colors of the containers;**
- c. Any distinctive stripes or other markings on those containers;**
- d. Any labels or writing on those containers (including the content of those labels);**
- e. Whether those containers were new or used; and**
- f. If those containers were used, a description of the prior use of the container;**

Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. PQS further objects to Request No. 22 as it assumes that each SHC is somehow individually identified, tracked, and used and reused by the same entity throughout the life of the SHC. There is no evidence that BAD operated in this way or that it tracked SHCs for its customers such that this information is available. Generally, SHCs, such as drums sent to drum reconditioners by a customer, are fungible commodities and are not individually tagged or tracked to ensure their return to that particular customer. Accordingly, Request No. 22 purports to seek information that does not exist.

As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." Moreover, the RFI defined "COCs" as "any of contaminants of concern" at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, DDT, chlordane, dieldrin, and PCBs. PQS further objects to Request No. 22 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, PQS has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. Additionally, PQS objects to Request No. 22 as it purports to seek information regarding containers used to remove each type of waste containing any SOIs from the Facilities and taken to any other place during any time. To the extent that EPA seek information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows:

No information has been located indicating that waste in drums was disposed of by PQS or QS at the BAD Site, or the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site. No information has been located regarding specific containers used to dispose of any waste containing any SOL.

Pursuant to conversations with Counsel for EPA, we are not required to provide supplemental information relating to the time period since 1988.

In addition, see PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 17.

- 23. For each type of waste generated at the Facilities that contained any of the SOIs, describe Respondent's contracts, agreements, or other arrangements for its disposal, treatment, or recycling and identify all parties to each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described. State the ownership of waste containers as specified under each contract, agreement, or other arrangement described and the ultimate destination or use for such containers. Distinguish between the Relevant Time Period and the time period since 1988, and describe any changes in Respondent's practices over time.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." Moreover, the RFI defined "COCs" as "any of the contaminants of concern at the Site and includes: lead, zinc, mercury, DDT, chlordane, dieldrin, and PCBs." PQS further objects to Request No. 23 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus PQS has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. Additionally, PQS objects to Request No.23 as it purports to seek information regarding waste generated at any Facilities that contained any SOIs and taken to any other place during any time. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site.

PQS's review of documents and information for this Supplemental Response did not locate any information responsive to this question. Since this question deals with circumstances and matters which occurred during a time period considerably outside of PQS's normal document retention policy, it is likely that there would be little or no documentation in the possession of PQS which would provide assistance in developing a response. PQS conducted an extensive review of an index of over 17,500 available records, and more than 100 possibly relevant boxes were retrieved and reviewed for responsive documents. No information has been located through this search indicating that waste in drums was disposed of by PQS or QS at the BAD Site, or the Yosemite Creek Superfund Site.

Pursuant to conversations with Counsel for EPA, we are not required to provide supplemental information relating to the time period since 1988.

In addition, see PQS's Supplemental Responses to Questions No. 17 and 22.

- 24. Identify all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for Respondent's environmental matters (including responsibility for the disposal, treatment, storage, recycling, or sale of Respondent's wastes and SHCs). Provide the job title, duties, dates performing those duties, supervisors for those duties, current position or the date of the individual's resignation, and the nature of the information possessed by such individuals concerning Respondent's waste management.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying all individuals who currently have, and those who have had, responsibility for PQS's environmental matters at all of PQS's Facilities, including those that have no nexus to the BAD Site, is not feasible due to the long history of existence/operations and number of PQS's locations.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows:

See PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No. 2.

A review of files indicates that the following former PQS/QS employees assisted with PQS's Responses to the EPA's Information Request regarding the Cooper Drum Site:

- **Duane Quale, warehouseman/forklift driver, PQS Vernon location**
- **James Lawson, operator, PQS Vernon location**
- **Will Wentzel, PQS Tucson Distribution location**
- **Milt Reilly, Chemist, PQS Vernon location**
- **Mike Treguboff, Environmental Safety Engineer, PQS Vernon location**
- **William C. Campbell, Senior Buyer, PQS**
- **Lydia Shirley, Materials/Inventory Planner, PQS Vernon location**
- **Mary Schillinger, Inventory/Analyst, PQS Vernon location**
- **Larry Dingley, Lead Compounder/Blender, PQS Vernon location**
- **Dan Vance, Quaker State employee, Terminal Island, Rancho Dominguez**
- **John Bickerstaff, Quaker State employee, Rancho Dominguez**

A review of files indicates that the following PQS/QS employees were interviewed in connection with the responses regarding the BAD Site and/or in responding to requests for information relating to the Lorentz Barrel Site:

- **Current Alameda Facility Plant Manager: Blake Fernandez.**
- **Current Environmental Representative: David Soza**
- **Former Alameda Facility Managers: Michael Bennett, Ron W. Hagen, Paul Hafemann**
- **Former Alameda Production Supervisor: Michael Rapoza**
- **Former Pennzoil employee: Dick Novak**
- **Former Pennzoil employee: Julie Obermiller Rapoza**
- **Former Pennzoil employee: Ruben Carmona**
- **Pennzoil employee: Duane Watson**
- **Former San Jose Facility Branch Manager: Dick Valentine**

Current or former employees, to the extent current contact information is available, can be contacted through PQS's Counsel, Roberta S. Lewis, 713-241-7188.

- 25. Did Respondent ever purchase drums or other containers from a drum recycler or drum reconditioner? If yes, identify the entities or individuals from which Respondent acquired such drums or containers.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. Identifying all drum recyclers or drum reconditioners from which PQS has ever acquired such drums or containers is not feasible due to long history of existence/operations and the number of PQS's locations. Moreover, identifying all such drum recyclers or drum reconditioners is not relevant to identifying the nature or quantity of materials which have been transported to the BAD Site.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows: In addition to Cooper Drum, PQS employees identified the following drum companies as having been used by the PQS Vernon location:

- Waymire Drum Company
- Ditty Drum Company
- Meyers Drum Company
- Grief Drum Company

In addition to Cooper Drum, invoices were found which showed the following drum companies were used by Quaker State:

- Myers Container Corporation in Portland, Oregon (used by QS locations in Eugene, Oregon; Kent, Washington; Vancouver, Washington; and Seattle, Washington)
- KTS Drum Company in Casa Grande, Arizona (used by QS location in Phoenix)
- Ted Levine Drum Company in Mesa, Arizona (used by QS locations in Phoenix and Tucson)
- Northwest Cooperage in Seattle, Washington (used by QS locations in Eugene, Oregon and Kent, Washington)
- Pacific Pallet Company in Long Beach, California (used by QS location in Fullerton, California)

Also, PQS was alleged by EPA to have sent drums to the Lorentz Barrel and Drum Site in San Jose, CA between 1958-1964, but no documentation was produced in that matter

by EPA or DTSC indicating which PQS facility is alleged to have sent drums to that site. No documentation or information was located in the possession of PQS during due diligence for responding to a CERCLA 104(e) request for that site indicating that any drums were sent from any PQS facility, in or out of California, to that site.

26. Prior to 1988, did Respondent always keep its waste streams that contained SOIs separate from its other waste streams?

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. PQS further objects to Request No. 26 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, PQS has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows:

PQS's review of documents and information for this Supplemental Response did not locate any information responsive to this question. Since this question deals with circumstances and matters which occurred during a time period considerably outside of PQS's normal document retention policy, it is likely that there would be little or no documentation in the possession of PQS which would provide assistance in developing a response. PQS conducted an extensive review of an index of over 17,500 available records, and more than 100 possibly relevant boxes were retrieved and reviewed for responsive documents. No documents relating to SOIs were located through this review that indicated whether waste streams containing these materials were segregated from other waste streams.

We reserve the right to supplement this response should information become available.

27. Identify all removal and remedial actions conducted pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act, 42 U.S.C. § 9601 et seq., or comparable state law; all corrective actions conducted pursuant to the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 42 U.S.C. § 6901 et seq.; and all cleanups

conducted pursuant to the Toxic Substances Control Act, 15 U.S.C § 2601 et seq. where (a) one of the COCs was addressed by the cleanup and (b) at which Respondent paid a portion of cleanup costs or performed work. Provide copies of all correspondence between Respondent and any federal or state government agency that (a) identifies a COC and (b) is related to one of the above-mentioned sites.

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. As stated in the RFI, "EPA is seeking to identify parties that have or may have contributed to contamination at the Site." However, Request No. 27 purports to seek information regarding a broad range of removal and remedial actions, corrective actions and cleanups. Moreover, identifying all such removal and remedial actions is not feasible due to the long history of existence/operations and the number of PQS's locations. To the extent that EPA seeks information about facilities that have no nexus with the BAD Site, this request is not relevant to the Site. PQS further objects to Request No. 27 to the extent that EPA is already in possession of the requested documents, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows:

Over the years, PQS/QS has had some kind of interaction regarding multiple waste sites located all across the United States. This interaction can range from a simple inquiry regarding PQS/QS's alleged use of a site all the way to PQS/QS's involvement in a settlement action and/or remedial or removal actions. As stated previously, identifying all such removal and remedial actions and further specifying those that involved an identified COC is not feasible due to the number of waste sites involved, the long history of existence/operations, and the number of PQS/QS locations. In addition, available information is likely incomplete due to the passage of time and the fact that we are limited to those files that Shell inherited from Pennzoil Company and Quaker State.

- 28. Provide all records of communication between Respondent and Bay Area Drum Company, Inc.; Meyers Drum Company; A.W. Sorich Bucket and Drum Company; Waymire Drum and Barrel Company, Inc.; Bedini Barrels Inc.; Bedini Steel Drum Corp.; Bedini Drum; or any other person or entity that owned or operated the facility located at 1212 Thomas Avenue, in the City and County of San Francisco, California.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. DTSC conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and PQS's operations in connection with it. DTSC's files include extensive records concerning the Bay Area Drum Company, Inc. and other persons and entities that owned or operated the facility located at 1212 Thomas Avenue, in the City and County of San Francisco, California. PQS understands that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files, they are readily available to EPA.

No supplemental response.

- 29. Identify the time periods regarding which Respondent does not have any records regarding the SOIs that were produced, purchased, used or stored at the Facilities.**

RESPONSE:

In addition to the General Objections set forth above, PQS objects to this request as overbroad in scope, unauthorized by law to the extent it is overbroad, and unduly burdensome. In responding to the RFI, PQS has undertaken a diligent and good faith search for, and review of, documents and information in its possession, custody or control and that are relevant to this matter. Moreover, PQS understands that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site. PQS is under no further obligation to identify time periods to which these documents do not pertain.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, and without any waiver of its objections, PQS responds as follows:

In addition to reviewing files regarding PQS's efforts to respond to the DTSC's Information Request regarding the BAD Site, PQS also reviewed files regarding its efforts to respond to an EPA Information Request regarding the Cooper Drum Site. Cooper Drum, located in Los Angeles County, California was a drum recycler which was apparently used by some PQS/QS locations, therefore documents and interviews of knowledgeable employees were reviewed for any information which might be relevant in supplementing our response to this Information Request. PQS and QS file indexes totalling more than 17,500 records also were reviewed for any possible connection to the

BAD site, the Cooper Drum Site, or anything relating to "drums," the COCs or SOL. More than 100 boxes were retrieved and reviewed for responsive documents.

Records relating to each facility's storage, production, purchasing and use of SOI may exist, but no such records were identified in the file indices or the boxes reviewed, other than any references to SOI in documents produced with this response.

- 30. Provide copies of all documents containing information responsive to the previous twenty-nine questions and identify the questions to which each document is responsive.**

RESPONSE:

PQS objects to Request No. 30 as it purports to seek information relating to hazardous substances beyond the specific chemicals for which EPA purports to have evidence of a release or threatened release to the environment at the Site and that is not relevant to the Site; thus, PQS has limited its review of documents and information to the COCs identified by EPA. PQS further objects to Request No. 30 as it purports to seek copies of documents containing information responsive to the previous twenty-nine questions. DTSC conducted an extensive investigation of the BAD Site and PQS's operations in connection with it. DTSC's investigation included an information request to PQS and the DTSC files include PQS's Response to DTSC's information request, among other documents. We understand that EPA is already in possession of DTSC's files regarding the BAD Site, and to the extent that EPA is not in possession of these files they are readily available to EPA. However, PQS is providing copies of such documents that were provided to PQS by the DTSC in the course of its involvement with the BAD site. These documents are included on two CDs, numbered PQS2 00001-01967 and are referenced in PQS's Supplemental Response to Question No 2.

Additional documents, numbered PQS2 01968-02116, are attached in hard copy form and are referenced in PQS's Supplemental Responses to Questions 4, 10 and 11.